## REMARKS

Claims 23 and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 13 to 26 are now pending in the present application.

Applicants request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.


**Claim for Foreign Priority**

Applicants request information regarding why the box labeled "Some*" was checked with regard to certified copies of the priority documents. No explanation was given in the Office Action as to what has not been received. The International Bureau should have already sent all copies of the certified copies of the priority documents to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.


**35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph**

Claims 13 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as nonenabling. In response to the specific comments in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that:

a) Claim 13 is enabled by the Specification, Drawings and Claims. Value tree is described and defined in statements and examples in the Specification at page 1, lines 3-5; page 2, lines 14-26; page 3, lines 5-14; page 3, line 35-page 4, line 3; page 5, lines 15-19; and page 6, lines 7-11 and 19-22; and in at least Figures 1-3. Further, baseManagedObjectClass is textually represented in Figure 2 and described in the Specification at page 4, line 33 - page 5, line 4; page 5, line 33 - page 6, line 5; page 6, lines 19-28; and page 1, lines 19-23. GetArgument is also addressed in those citations.

b) Claim 16 is enabled by the Specification, Drawings and Claims. Processing is described and defined in statements and examples in the Specification at page 3, lines 5-14 and lines 16-24; page 2, line 28-page 3, line 3; and page 1, lines 3-5.

The statement "at least one of data and the value list is initialized" can mean that at least the data is initialized, or at least the value list is initialized, or at least the data and the value list are initialized.

c) Claim 17 is enabled by the Specification, Drawings and Claims. The value is transferred and transfer syntax are described and defined in statements and examples in the Specification

at page 3, lines 26-33 and page 4, lines 19-25.

d) Claim 19 is enabled by the Specification, Drawings and Claims. Input of information and assignment are described and defined in statements and examples throughout the Specification, including at page 3, line 35 - page 4, line 7; page 3, lines 5-14; page 2, line 28 - page 3, line 3.

The statement "should be performed one of automatically and following a manual input" can means that it should be performed automatically or that it should be performed following a manual input.

e) Claim 20 is enabled by the Specification, Drawings and Claims. Intermediately storing and clicking on the subtree is described and defined in statements and examples in the Specification, including at page 4, lines 19-25. The intermediately storing is used in its normal sense – there is an intermediate storage. Applicants submit that this statement is in plain English and sufficiently supported by the Specification and what one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the term to mean.

f) Claim 22 is enabled by the Specification, Drawings and Claims. Applicants submit that storable is plain English and sufficiently supported by the Specification and what one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the term to mean. Additional information is described and defined in statements and examples in the Specification, including at page 4, line 33 - page 5, line 4.

g) The remaining claims were not addressed due to the aforementioned rejections.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 to 26 are enabled (and thus allowable) by the Specification and Drawings (along with knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art). Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph of claims 13 to 26 be withdrawn in light of the comments and explanations above and in the Specification and Drawings.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 13 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete. Specifically, claim 13 was rejected for not specifying where the values are to be inputted. And, claims 23 and 24 were rejected because claim 13 did not specify input of

values. Claims 23 and 24 have been amended to correct this informality. Claim 24 now properly depends from claim 23. And, claim 23 has been amended for clarification purposes. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 to 26 are allowable in light of the amendments to claims 23 and 24. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph of claims 13 to 26 be withdrawn in light of the comments and amendments above.

## 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Ebert Reference

Claims 13, 18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,278,991 to Ebert.

The Ebert reference purportedly concerns a browser for viewing data representing text, pictures, sounds, virtual reality worlds, links, or other objects, and organized in a hierarchical structure which is provided to display and interact with links to the data. Abstract, lines 1-4. The Ebert reference refers to a retrieved set of data being displayed in a lens, and subsequently retrieved sets of data that are deeper in the hierarchical structure which are displayed in further stacked lenses, creating a visual representation of the hierarchy. Abstract, lines 4-8.

Claim 13 is directed to a method for graphically representing a value of a data type of a formally defined data structure existing as a value tree, including:

> assigning a window as a graphical user interface to the data structure;
> inserting hierarchically at least one generic, scalable, graphical user-interface component in the window, the value tree of the data structure being mapped onto the at least one user-interface component;
> providing that the at least one graphical user interface component is in a recognizable relation to at least one node of the value tree; and
> providing at least one of a graphical representation and a textual representation of the value is selectable for each subtree of the value tree.

The Ebert reference does not appear to identically describe each and every feature of claim 13. That is, the Ebert reference appears to concern a label on each lens which provides information on the data originally displayed in the lens – and a user may choose to view the originally displayed contents of any lens on the screen. Abstract, lines 8-11. The Ebert reference further refers to a user modifying a personal hierarchical data structure comprising links to sets of data in the first hierarchical structure and in doing so, a user creates an entirely new hierarchical structure. Abstract, lines 11-17. However, the Ebert reference does not

7

appear to identically describe assigning a window as a graphical user interface to the data structure; inserting hierarchically at least one generic, scalable, graphical user-interface component in the window, the value tree of the data structure being mapped onto the at least one user-interface component; providing that the at least one graphical user interface component is in a recognizable relation to at least one node of the value tree; and providing a graphical representation and/or a textual representation of the value which is selectable for each subtree of the value tree, as in claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is allowable. Claims 14 to 26 depend from claim 13 and are allowable for the same reasons as claim 13. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Ebert reference is respectfully requested.

## 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Ebert Reference in view of Michael Brydon Reference

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,278,991 to Ebert in view of the Michael Brydon reference.

As discussed above, claims 14 and 15 are believed allowable over the Ebert reference.

The Michael Brydon reference does not appear to cure the deficiencies of the Ebert reference. The Michael Brydon reference purportedly concerns a combo box defined as a list of values from which a user can select a single value. Page 1. According to the Michael Brydon reference, the combo box has no intrinsic search capability and while they change values, they do not automatically move to the record with the value selected by the user. Page 2. However, the Michael Brydon reference does not appear to identically describe assigning a window as a graphical user interface to the data structure; inserting hierarchically at least one generic, scalable, graphical user-interface component in the window, the value tree of the data structure being mapped onto the at least one user-interface component; providing that the at least one graphical user interface component is in a recognizable relation to at least one node of the value tree; and providing a graphical representation and/or a textual representation of the value which is selectable for each subtree of the value tree, as in claim 13 (and thus, claims 14 and 15). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14 and 15 are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the Ebert reference in view of the Michael Brydon reference is respectfully requested.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that all of claims 12 to 26 of the above-

identified application are allowable for the foregoing reasons.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the objections/rejections of claims 13 to 26 have been obviated or overcome. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all claims 13 to 26, as presented above, are now allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objections/rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

If it would further allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the contact information given below.

Respectfully submitted, *By : Onида Shudy*
*Reg, No. 47084*

Dated: *April 27, 2004*

By: *Richard L. Mayer*
Richard L. Mayer (Reg. No. 22,490)

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

9